

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2-44 have been canceled. Claims 45-88 have been added. Therefore, claims 1 and 45-88 are now pending in the application.

In the Office Communication of June 9, 2005, the Examiner states that the reply filed on November 2, 2005 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because the amendment cancels all claims drawn to the elected invention and presents only claims drawn to a nonelected invention. The present amendment does not cancel claim 1. Therefore, Applicants' amendment does not cancel all claims drawn to the elected invention.

Furthermore, Applicants' petition traversing the restriction requirement was **GRANTED**. The Examiner still has not stated a proper restriction requirement. In regard to the restriction requirement the Examiner only states: "The remaining claims are not readable on the elected invention because it involves a step of controlling the access of network resources, wherein the cancelled claims were void of such features." The Examiner is incorrect. For example, cancelled claim 6 refers to controlling access. Furthermore, the Examiner's statement is not a proper reason to require restriction. As explained in Applicants' **granted** petition, and as stated at M.P.E.P. § 808:

Every requirement to restrict has two aspects: (A) the reasons (as distinguished from the mere statement of conclusion) why each invention *as claimed* is either independent or distinct from the other(s); and (B) the reasons why there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required, i.e., the reasons for insisting upon restriction therebetween as set forth in the following sections. (underline emphasis added).

Since the Examiner has not satisfied either of the above requirements for restriction, added claims 45-88 must be entered and examined.

Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection:

In the Office Action of September 19, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-12, 14, 16-18, 20, 23-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 38-42 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite in regard to the term "tentatively." The term "tentatively" has been deleted from the claims.

Section 102(b) Rejection:

In the Office Action of September 19, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kingdon et al. (U.S. Patent 5,784,560) (hereinafter "Kingdon"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In regard to claim 1, Kingdon does not teach attaching a macro to the given node or to a higher level node; upon access to a subnode of said given node in the tree; generating an expanded version of the access control information using the macro, wherein the expanded version comprises additional information derived from one or more attributes stored at the directory server. There is no mention of any macro in Kingdon that is attached to the given node or to a higher level node. Nor does Kingdon describe generating an expanded version of the access control information using the macro, wherein the expanded version comprises additional information derived from one or more attributes stored at the directory server. Therefore, Kingdon clearly cannot be said to anticipate claim 1.

Added independent claim 45 recites a computer-implemented method, comprising, in part, "storing access control information for a particular node of a tree of nodes representing entities managed by a directory server, wherein the access control information comprises at least one macro entry, and, in response to a request from a requester for a directory server operation targeted at a node of the tree, generating an expanded version of the access control information using the macro entry, wherein the

expanded version comprises additional information derived from one or more attributes stored at the directory server."

Applicants respectfully submit that the features recited in claim 45 are not taught or suggested by Kingdon, and that claim 45, along with its dependent claims, is therefore in condition for allowance. Independent claims 60 and 75 also recite features using language similar to that of claim 45, and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance along with their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION


Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-06200/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Other

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: July 10, 2006